

Professor Seelye's speech last week against the action of the Electoral Commission in the Louisiana case was hardly so judicial and statesman-like as it seemed. He thinks there was "heinous corruption" on the one side, and "horrible cruelty" on the other. He can't tell which was worse. He admits that, according to a "clear principle of the Constitution," which "in its general application is as wise as it is clear," the decision of the Commission accepting the electoral returns for Hayes and Wheeler was correct. Still, he is fearfullest the *summum jus* may somehow become *summa injuria*. Pausing dubiously before a number of "what ifs," with an allusion to the "pound of flesh" and the "drop of blood," he turns away to the conclusion that the State should have been either counted against the Republicans, or else not counted at all, which would in this case have amounted to the same thing. The experience of the judge who, when only one side had been argued, felt that it was easy enough to decide the question, but who, after hearing both sides, found himself at his wit's end, seems to have been paralleled. For, if the verdict of the Commission in the Louisiana case was clearly in accordance with the wise provisions of the Constitution; and the "horrible cruelties" of the systematic scheme of intimidation is so certainly proved; and it is morally certain to have had immense influence upon the colored vote in several of the other States, does Mr. Seelye mean to affirm that the *summum jus* of Mr. Hayes's declared election implies a *summa injuria* to either the Constitution, the State of Louisiana, the South, or the country at large? From his own premises his conclusion seems to us inconsequential. So far as his speech contained a righteously indignant protest against political frauds and political cruelties, it was grand, and therefore worthy of himself.

We have just received a letter from a friend in Texas, whom we have known for the past five years, detailing some of the "horrible cruelties," as Prof. Seelye terms it, which have been practiced upon himself. This man, with the motives of the purest philanthropy, left his home in England on purpose to come over here and take his part in giving to the poor freedmen of the South the advantages of Christian education. He went with his wife, to a town in Texas. Without meddling in any officious way with political affairs, he gave himself earnestly to the work of building up a school for the colored people. But his errand was taken as a rebuke, and his presence an offense to the whites in that region. For several years they persistently treated him with all manner of indignities, threatened

his wife into insanity and invalidism, and while he lay suffering from his wounds, set fire to his house, a few days since, and burned it with all his possessions. Another letter from New Orleans, from Secretary Powell, of the American Missionary Association, informs us that just before reaching that city, two weeks ago, the buildings of Straight University, founded by the Association, had also been set fire to by incendiaries and consumed. The noble school buildings owned by the same Missionary Association in Macon, Ga., and Mobile, Ala., were similarly destroyed some time since. These and such like occurrences do not, indeed, prove that all our white brethren in the South are animated by feelings of malign hostility to the colored people or to those who come from the North to help educate them; but they are quite sufficient to show the need of retaining in the national government some kind of "supreme right" competent to defend the hapless and helpless children of slavery from the "supreme injury" of this kind. The Government cannot educate them; but the Government should show itself competent, and in the last resort, disposed at least to protect them.

every State legislature, save where a better law already exists.

—Mr. Boar, in the midst of a debate in Congress last Monday, remarked that prophecy was not one of the exact sciences, but he would venture the prophecy that there "would not be an event in the history of the country which would be in the future more gratifying to the American people than the Constitutional assertion of the limit between state and national authority which the Electoral Commission had made."

—Mr. John Welsh, of Philadelphia, who earned no little distinction as chairman of the Centennial Finance Committee, has just been very handsomely complimented. The City of Philadelphia presented him with a check for Fifty-Thousand Dollars from the City of Philadelphia, being "too good to keep," and promptly hands the same over to Gov. Packer, President ex-officio of the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, "for the endowment of the chair of History and English Literature." A fortunate wind that blows so gaily all around.

—Dr. Felix Adler lectured the other day on the origin of the Hebrew religion, attributing its birth and growth to "climatic and political conditions in Palestine," and rejecting the theory of Divine revelation. He said that the idea of one personal God was the outcome of a moral need, the result of an uprising of conscience. As to the existence of a personal God, he affirmed that "dogmatic assertion in the negative is as unwarrantable as dogmatic assertion in the affirmative. But if there lives a God, he will not count their services less who do not put their shoulders to the wheel to work in the way of an ampler justice and a wider truth." Dr. Adler has a considerable following among rationalistic Jews in New York. Dr. Kohler, pastor of one of the Jewish synagogues in Chicago, occupies nearly the same ground.

NOTES AT THE BOSTON MEETINGS.

—“I am a Christian, but not your style,” is the common answer given by inquirers from the “liberal” congregations in Boston, of whom there are scores. Moody well answers, “*My style is nothing ; God’s style, the Bible’s style is everything.*”

—Washington's birthday gave a needed opportunity to the masses of business and working men to attend Post Office meetings. More had to be turned away for lack of room than on any previous day; and a much larger number than ever before sought the inquiry room.

—We saw recently a respectable looking lady church-member reading a pamphlet during her pastor's sermon, and that, too, directly under his eye. It was more discourteous to the preacher than to read during a social call. More than that, it was an insult to Him whose worship she was there to engage in.

our lips. The ideas appear to legitimate the methods." Very certainly they do, and consequently Dr. Ryder had no ground, whatever, for his charge of illiberality against Mr. Moody and the evangelical churches of Chicago. His complaint was as foolish as if some sentimentalist had shed tears because the Republicans did not invite the Democrats to hold union meetings with them!

That gun of complaint being thus spiked by the Universalists themselves, we are content to have the old objections to our doctrines and measures, judged by the fruits of the two systems. The question is, Which kind of religion has in it the requisite power of impression? Which kind actually saves the soul? Which is accompanied by real holiness? Which produces the most earnestness in the pursuit of holiness? Which is attended with the least sin? Which is the most apostolic zeal and the most

OFFICE OF THE JOURNAL,

Orange, N. J.

Nov. 28, 1877.

My Dear Garrison,

274 Your letter has just come from the mails, and I am glad you took the liberty of expressing your views in a manner so clear and unequivocal. I take your criticism in perfect good part, knowing that it springs from honest convictions and a genuine love for humanity. "Let the righteous smite me; it shall be a kindness; and let him reprove me; it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head." If your language seems to me overheated, I will not on that account take any offence, for I know the strength of your feelings and the earnestness of your convictions. How sorry I am to differ from you it would be difficult for me to say. But I also am a man of strong convictions, and in the habit of forming and expressing my opinions for myself, and every

day's reflection serves but to convince
me that I am right.

I will not answer the points
of your letter, not because I do not
feel myself perfectly able to do so, but
because I think it would not probably
do any good. Your opinions are fixed, so
are mine, and time ^{will} ~~show~~ show which of
us is right. In regard for the rights
and the welfare of the negroes I yield nothing
to anybody, not even to you; and it is
my firm belief that the course of Presi-
dent Hayes, so far as it concerns them,
has not only been such as the Constitu-
tion and his oath of office required,
but the best that he could have taken
to secure their welfare. I can make no
apology for my opinions any more than
you can apologize for yours. We must
agree to differ - that is all that we can
do. If at any time you desire to answer
any article of mine in the Journal I will
most gladly give you a hearing, and it

will be ^{my} ~~misfortune~~ ^{an} if I ^{am} unable to defend
myself against so powerful an antagonist.
For you I cherish such a regard as I feel for
no other man, and under no provocation what-
ever can I ever speak to you or of you one
unkind ~~word~~ ^{word}. If I hope it is not impos-
sible for you to believe in my integrity in
spite of our differences; but if otherwise I
shall not blame you nor reproach you.
It is enough for me to be deeply convinced
that I am right; and that time and
reflection will confirm my judgment.

I wish you had found room in
your letter to tell me something of your
health, which I hope is improving. I
have just returned from Peasham,
whither I went, by invitation, to lecture.
My subject was "the Early Anti-Slavery
Days," and I think you would have
heard with pleasure all that I said.

Mrs. Johnson is not so well as I
could wish, but our little Helen is in
perfect health, and growing finely.

I am suffering from a cold, but
I am with all the old regard and
affection,
Yours, faithfully,

River Johnson.